UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,179	07/03/2003	Demitri Anastassopoulos	MS1-1561US	4899

22801	7590	04/04/2006

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
BARBEE, MANUEL L

ART UNIT	·PAPER NUMBER
2857	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/613,179	ANASTASSOPOULOS ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Manuel L. Barbee	2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.

  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 July 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

  1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

  2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

  3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .   6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings are objected to because Figure 3 uses the number "320" to

designate two steps. The "Establish/Create Comm. Channel with Server Computer"

step should be labeled --325--, as shown in the specification on page 12, line 18.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to

the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement

drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version

of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an

amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be

canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and

where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes

made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency.

Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the

remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application

must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 32, 34, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Conan et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0012986).

With regard to a memory and a processor, as shown in claims 32 and 37, Conan et al. teach a server and a client process that each store files for configuration and executing tests (Figs. 1-3, pars. 22, 23). With regard to instructions stored in memory to access a test tool on a server computer, as shown in claim 32 and a memory to store instructions to access a remote client, as shown in claims 37, Conan et al. teach a sever with a test bucket and a test execution script and a client process with a listener process and a test script file and a test execution process (Figs. 2, 3, pars 33-45). With regard to a virtual channel for communication, as shown in claims 34 and 38, Conan et al. teach using a socket for communication between the server and the client (pars. 40, 41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12-15, 19, 20, 23, 33, 40, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conan et al. in view of Mathews (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0098879).

With regard to establishing a session with a server computer and receiving a set

of instructions and data directed to providing testing from the server computer, based on

performing a test tool resident at the server computer, as shown in claim 1, Conan et al.

teach submitting test cases including test scripts from a job execution process from a

server computer to a client process for execution (pars. 30, 38; Figs. 2, 3, pars 33-45).

With regard to creating a virtual channel and transferring testing information through the

virtual channel, as shown in claim 1, Conan et al. teach using sockets for

communication between the server and the client process and transmitting test results

back to the server from the client (pars 32, 40, 41). Conan et al. do not teach graphics

testing, as shown in claim 1. Mathews teaches distributed graphical user interface

(GUI) testing (Abstract, pars. 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify computer testing, as taught by

Conan et al., to include GUI testing, as taught by Mathews, because then the interface

an user uses to operate the software would have been verified to operate correctly

(Mathews, par. 2).

With regard to receiving a request from the server computer, as shown in claim

2, Conan et al. teach that the server submits the test case to the client process (par.

30). With regard to forming a virtual channel through a wide area network or the

Internet, as shown in claims 6 and 7, Conan et al. teach using web communication and

TCP/IP for the sockets (pars. 3, 24). With regard to registering a unique virtual identifier

with the server computer, as shown in claim 8, Conan et al. teach registering the client

resources with the server (par. 45). With regard to a personal computer, as shown in

claim 12, Conan et al. teach a computer (pars. 22, 23).

Conan et al. do not teach receiving a request to the server to establish the

session, as shown in claim 3. Mathews teaches submitting requests to the server from

a client computer (par. 32, Figure 3, step 100). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify computer testing,

as taught by Conan et al., to submitting a request to the server, as taught by Mathews,

because then an user at a client would have been able to verify the proper operation of

software at the client.

With regard to establishing a session with a remote client, storing a set of

instructions and data in a registry and sending the set of instructions and data to a

remote client computer and performing the testing by a resident test tool, as shown in

claim 13, Conan et al. teach submitting test cases including test scripts from a job

execution process from a server computer to a client process for execution (pars. 30,

38; Figs. 2, 3, pars 33-45). With regard to creating a virtual channel, as shown in claim

13, Conan et al. teach using sockets for communication between the server and the

client process and transmitting test results back to the server from the client (pars 32,

40, 41). Conan et al. do not teach graphics testing, as shown in claim 13. Mathews

teaches distributed graphical user interface (GUI) testing (Abstract, pars. 14-16). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify computer testing, as taught by Conan et al., to include GUI testing, as

taught by Mathews, because then the interface an user uses to operate the software would have been verified to operate correctly (Mathews, par. 2).

With regard to sending a request to a remote client, as shown in claim 15, Conan et al. teach that the server submits the test case to the client process (par. 30). With regard to forming a virtual channel through a wide area network or the Internet, as shown in claims 19 and 20, Conan et al. teach using web communication and TCP/IP for the sockets (pars. 3, 24). With regard to a server computer, as shown in claim 23, Conan et al. teach a server computer (pars. 22, 23).

Conan et al. do not teach receiving a request from the remote client, as shown in claim 14. Mathews teaches submitting requests to the server from a client computer (par. 32, Figure 3, step 100). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify computer testing, as taught by Conan et al., to submitting a request to the server, as taught by Mathews, because then an user at a client would have been able to verify the proper operation of software at the client.

Conan et al. teach all the limitations of claim 32 upon which claim 33 depends and claim 37 upon which claim 40 depends. Conan et al. do not teach graphics testing, as shown in claims 33 and 40. Mathews teaches distributed graphical user interface (GUI) testing (Abstract, pars. 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify computer testing, as taught by Conan et al., to include GUI testing, as taught by Mathews, because then the interface

an user uses to operate the software would have been verified to operate correctly (Mathews, par. 2).

With regard to a client computer and a server to identify software modules resident on the server computer to provide testing through a communication channel, as shown in claim 47, Conan et al. teach a server computer and a client process and submitting test scripts generated from tests stored on the server to the client computer through a socket (pars. 22, 23, 30, 38, 40). Conan et al. do not teach graphics testing, as shown in claim 47. Mathews teaches distributed graphical user interface (GUI) testing (Abstract, pars. 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify computer testing, as taught by Conan et al., to include GUI testing, as taught by Mathews, because then the interface an user uses to operate the software would have been verified to operate correctly (Mathews, par. 2). With regard to a virtual channel, as shown in claim 48, Conan teach using sockets for communication between the server and the client process and transmitting test results back to the server from the client (pars 32, 40, 41).

6.   Claims 4, 5, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conan et al. in view of Mathews as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Perugini et al. (US Patent No. 5,896,494).

Conan et al. and Mathews teach all the limitations of claim 1 upon which claims 4 and 5 depend and claim 13 upon which claims 16 and 17 depend. Further, with regard to a test tool that is a series of tests that are part of a test application program resident on the server computer, as shown in claims 4, 5, 16 and 17, Conan et al. teach

generating a test script based on test cases selected from a test bucket on the server

(par. 30). Conan et al. and Mathews do not teach that the instructions comprise a

dynamic link library (DLL), as shown in claims 4 and 16. Perugini et al. teach diagnostic

modules that are DLL's (col. 9, line 43 - col. 10, line 7). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify computer

testing combination, as taught by Conan et al. and Mathews, to include DLL's for testing

modules, as taught by Perugini et al., because then computers using a Windows

operating system would have been tested.

7.   Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Conan et al. in view of Mathews as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in

view of Packer (US Patent No. 5,978,575).

Conan et al. and Mathews teach all the limitations of claim 1 upon which claim 9

depends and claim 13 upon which claim 21 depends. Further, with regard to executing

tests in a list of tests prior to succeeding tests in the list of tests, as shown in claim 9,

Conan et al. teach submitting a test script to be executed by the client computer (pars.

30, 43). Conan et al. and Mathews do not teach timing each of the tests and storing the

time, as shown in claim 9, or timing how long information related to graphics testing is

sent, as shown in claim 21. Packer teaches timing the execution of a test (Abstract). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify computer testing combination, as taught by Conan et al. and Mathews,

to include timing tests, as taught by Packer, because then the test would have given an

accurate reflection of computer performance (Packer, col. 1, lines 36-55).

8.   Claims 10, 11, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Conan et al. in view of Mathews as applied to claims 1 and 13 above,

and further in view of Klein et al. (US Patent No. 6,526,371).

Conan et al. and Mathews teach all the limitations of claim 1 upon which claims

10 and 11 depend and claim 13 upon which claim 22 depends. Conan et al. and

Mathews do not teach timing the establishing of a session, as shown in claims 10 and

22, or timing the logging off, as shown in claim 11. Klein teaches timing the response

time when a transaction is initiated (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify computer testing

combination, as taught by Conan et al. and Mathews, to include measuring response

time, as taught by Klein et al., because then performance of various applications would

have been measured (Klein et al., col. 1, lines 33-49).

9.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conan

et al. in view of Mathews and Perugini et al. as applied to claim 17 above, and further in

view of Packer.

Conan et al., Mathews and Perugini et al. teach all the limitations of claim 17

upon which claim 18 depends. Conan et al., Mathews and Perugini et al. do not teach

timing each of the tests, as shown in claim 18. Packer teaches timing the execution of a

test (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify computer testing combination, as taught by Conan et

al., Mathews and Perugini et al., to include timing tests, as taught by Packer, because

then the test would have given an accurate reflection of computer performance (Packer,

col. 1, lines 36-55).

10.   Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mathews in view of Packer.

With regard to means for performing graphics tests from a remote test tool

resident on a server computer and means for facilitating receipt of the graphics tests on

the computer, as shown in claim 24, Mathews teaches distributing GUI tests over a

network from a server to client computers for execution (Abstract, pars. 14-16).

Mathews does not teach means for timing the graphics tests, as shown in claim 24.

Packer teaches timing the execution of a test (Abstract). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify GUI testing,

as taught by Mathews, to include timing tests, as taught by Packer, because then the

test would have given an accurate reflection of computer performance (Packer, col. 1,

lines 36-55).

11.   Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mathews in view of Packer as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Perugini

et al.

Mathews and Packer teach all the limitations of claim 24 upon which claim 25

depends. Mathews and Packer do not teach a dynamic link library, as shown in claim

25. Perugini et al. teach diagnostic modules that are DLL's (col. 9, line 43 - col. 10, line

7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify GUI testing combination, as taught by Mathews and Packer, to

include DLL's for testing modules, as taught by Perugini et al., because then computers using a Windows operating system would have been tested.

12.   Claims 26 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathews in view of Packer as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Conan et al.

Mathews and Packer teach all the limitations of claim 24 upon which claims 26 and 27 depend. Mathews and Packer do not teach establishing a virtual channel through a wide area network or the Internet, as shown in claims 26 and 27. Conan et al. teach using web communication and TCP/IP for the sockets (pars. 3, 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify GUI testing combination, as taught by Mathews and Packer, to include sockets through the web, as taught by Conan et al., because the sockets would have facilitated communication between the server and the client.

13.   Claims 28, 30, 31, 36 and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conan et al. in view of Packer.

With regard to means for accessing a remote client computer and storing instructions and data used by a test tool resident at the server computer to provide testing to the remote client computer, as shown in claim 28, Conan et al. submitting test cases including test scripts from a job execution process from a server computer to a client process for execution (pars. 30, 38; Figs. 2, 3, pars 33-45). With regard to means for identifying particular instructions and data, as shown in claim 28, Conan et al. teach using a test request to select test cases to be used to generate the test script (par. 28).

With regard to means for setting up a virtual channel, as shown in claim 28, Conan et al.

teach setting up socket connections (pars. 40, 41). Conan et al. do not teach means for

timing the tests, as shown in claim 28. Packer teaches timing the execution of a test

(Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify computer testing, as taught by Conan et al., to include

timing tests, as taught by Packer, because then the test would have given an accurate

reflection of computer performance (Packer, col. 1, lines 36-55).

Conan et al. teach all the limitations of claim 32 upon which claim 36 depends

and claim 37 upon which claim 41 depends. Conan et al. do not teach means for timing

the tests, as shown in claims 36 and 41. Conan et al. do not teach means for timing the

tests, as shown in claim 28. Packer teaches timing the execution of a test (Abstract). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify computer testing, as taught by Conan et al., to include timing tests, as

taught by Packer, because then the test would have given an accurate reflection of

computer performance (Packer, col. 1, lines 36-55).

With regard to contacting a server to send instructions and data, as shown in

claim 42, Conan et al. teach submitting test cases stored at a server computer to a

client process for execution (pars. 30, 38). With regard to setting up a virtual channel in

which testing is performed by the test tool, as shown in claim 42, Conan et al. teach

setting up socket connections for communicating testing information from the job

execution process on the server and the test scripts transferred to the client (pars. 40,

41). Conan et al. do not teach determining the beginning and ending of individual tests,

as shown in clam 42, or timing the tests and storing the time, as shown in claims 43 and

44. Packer teaches timing the execution of a test and storing the times (Abstract, col. 5,

line 23 - col. 6, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify computer testing, as taught by Conan et al.,

to include timing tests, as taught by Packer, because then the test would have given an

accurate reflection of computer performance (Packer, col. 1, lines 36-55).

14.   Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conan

et al. in view of Packer as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Perugini et

al.

Conan et al. and Packer teach all the limitations of claim 28 upon which claim 29

depends. Conan et al. and Packer do not teach a dynamic link library, as shown in

claim 29. Perugini et al. teach diagnostic modules that are DLL's (col. 9, line 43 - col.

10, line 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify computer testing combination, as taught by Conan et al.

and Packer, to include DLL's for testing modules, as taught by Perugini et al., because

then computers using a Windows operating system would have been tested.

15.   Claims 35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Conan et al. in view of Perugini et al.

Conan et al. teach all the limitations of claim 32 upon which claim 35 depends

and claim 37 upon which claim 39 depends. Conan et al. does not teach a dynamic link

library, as shown in claims 35 and 39. Perugini et al. teach diagnostic modules that are

DLL's (col. 9, line 43 - col. 10, line 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify computer testing, as taught

by Conan et al., to include DLL's for testing modules, as taught by Perugini et al.,

because then computers using a Windows operating system would have been tested.

16.   Claims 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Conan et al. in view of Mathews and Perugini et al.

With regard to a processor configured to initiate a session with a remote client

computing device and a memory module to perform testing regarding a resident test to

a remote computer, as shown in claim 45, Conan et al. teach a server that submits tests

to a client (pars. 30, 38). With regard to an interface and a virtual channel between the

computing device and the remote client, as shown in claims 45 and 46, Conan et al.

teach using sockets for communication (pars. 40, 41). Conan et al. do not teach

dynamic link libraries or graphics testing, as shown in claim 45.

Perugini et al. teach diagnostic modules that are DLL's (col. 9, line 43 - col. 10,

line 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify computer testing, as taught by Conan et al., to include

DLL's for testing modules, as taught by Perugini et al., because then computers using a

Windows operating system would have been tested. Mathews teaches distributed

graphical user interface (GUI) testing (Abstract, pars. 14-16). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

computer testing, as taught by Conan et al., to include GUI testing, as taught by

Mathews, because then the interface an user uses to operate the software would have

been verified to operate correctly (Mathews, par. 2).

Response to Arguments

17.   Applicant's arguments filed 21 February 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to independent claims 1, 13, 28, 32, 37, 42, 45 and 47, Applicant states that Conan et al. teach a client process that is resident and ran on the target or client machines and does not teach a test tool resident on a sever computer and performing testing using the test tool through a communication channel. Conan teaches a test scripts that are stored on the server computer and transferred to the client computer by a job process module when performing testing on the client computer components (Figs. 2, 3, pars 33-45). The test scripts and the job process module are a test tool and the test scripts are transmitted to the clients for execution. Applicant further states that Conan does not teach that the sockets provide or create a virtual channel. A socket is by definition is a virtual port (Webster's New World Computer Dictionary, Ninth Edition, page 340).

With regard to claim 24, Applicant states that Mathews teach testing at the client systems and not through a resident application at the server. Mathews teaches storing the tests at the server and transmitting the tests to the clients through a test server engine for execution (pars. 14-16; Fig. 1). The test engine and the tests are a test tool and the client computers receive the tests from the test tool for execution.

Applicant states that a corrected drawing sheet with Fig. 3 is provided with the response. However, this drawing was not received and the corrected drawing requested again.

Conclusion

18.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Manuel L. Barbee whose telephone number is 571-272-

2212. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Marc S. Hoff can be reached on 571-272-2216. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mlb
March 21, 2006

MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800